IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.3075 OF 2006

Rajesh Upadhaya Applicant
versus
State of Maharashtra & anr. Respondents

S.K.Chaurasia i/by A.M.Saraogi for applicant.

M.H.Mhatre, APP for respondents.

CORAM : S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.

DATE : 22nd August 2006

PC :

1. The applicant had applied for anticipatory bail before the Sessions Court but the application is rejected on 16th August 2006. The applicant has moved this application to seek transit bail.

2. The application is lacking in all material particulars. The necessary and relevant facts including how and when the applicant is summoned and in connection with what offence, are not set out, leave alone with sufficient clarity, in this application.

3. The applicant in para 7 has mentioned about FIR No.712 of 2006. It is not stated as to in what capacity the applicant is connected therewith. A copy of the order which requires attendance at the investigation invoking Section 160 of the CPC and signed by the Police Officer, Delhi Police, is handed in across the bar. The applicant is shown therein as residing at Mumbai and has been summoned in connection with an inquiry into the offence allegedly committed under the Copyright Act.

4. In my view, unless all particulars are disclosed and where the applicant apprehends arrest in the commission of a non bailable offence, are pointed out with sufficient clarity and details, the application cannot be considered.

5. The applicant has failed to set out necessary and relevant particulars as noted above. Application is, therefore, dismissed.

(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)